

2.3. NEW ARTS, MEDIA AND MEDIATORS AS A WORLD OF MEANINGS IN NEW MEDIA

DOI 10.15826/B978-5-7996-3081-2.42

The Mass Media Communicative Situation and the Text Semantics

Muravleva Valeriya

Military University of the Ministry of Defense, Moscow, Russia

VR.Muravleva@mail.ru

Abstract. The article dwells on the notion of a standard communicative situation from the perspective of modern Media communication. The study concludes that the language of Mass Media is highly influenced by nonlinguistic factors (author's and readers' personalities and activities, communication conditions and some others). The attempt to analyze the components of a prototypic communicative situation of printed Mass Media and their interaction is made on the basis of the works of different researchers.

Keywords: communicative situation, linguistic semantics factors, mass media, media communication, nonlinguistic semantic factors

1. Introduction

Modern linguistic researches do not limit themselves to the sphere of the internal linguistics as it has been done by Ferdinand de Saussure. Today linguists go beyond the bounds of understanding a language as a closed system of symbols and consider it in conjunction with the process of human thinking, culture and society in the whole. Modern anthropocentric paradigm puts a human being to the centre of scientific researches, offering a scientist to analyze interrelations of human beings and languages from different points of view. Due to this fact the deepest understanding of the political constituent of the Mass Media texts is possible only when the components of the communicative situation, such as the context of communication, its participants, their implicit motives and some other elements are taken into account, or

in other words, it becomes possible by means of using a system-structural model of speech activity [Bernatskaya, 2018, 69].

The subject-matter of the article is a communicative situation from the perspective of modern Media communication.

The aim is to formulate the structure and components of the communicative situation realized by the modern Mass Media and to trace their influence upon the linguistic features of the text by conducting an exploratory case study.

2. Materials and Methods

The study of communicative situations is one of the most important areas of research in the domestic and foreign science. Despite a large number of scientific papers by leading scholars such as M. Bakhtin, R. Blakar, H. Clark, T. A. van Dijk, R. Jakobson, R. Lakoff, N. Leonov, G. N. Leech, E. Sidorov and many others devoted to the problems of communicative situations and acts functioning, there are still quite a lot of issues that require special study.

Due to the modern interdisciplinary and anthropocentric approach to scientific researches the article is based on the interpretation and combination of linguistic and non-linguistic information.

3. Historical remarks of a communicative situation structure studies

The structure of a communicative situation has been of great interest of scientists for a long period of time. Aristotle while dwelling on ancient rhetoric distinguished its 3 main elements: the speaker, the listener and the subject of the discussion [Aristotel, 1978, 24].

One of the most well-known schemes of a communicative situation belongs to R. Jacobson. According to the famous Russian linguist, a standard communicative situation consists of six components, such as:

1. addresser;
2. addressee;
3. contact (the process of interpersonal interaction between communicants, the peculiarities of its flow);
4. message;
5. context (message or context provide certain information that is transmitted from one subject to another, that is, they perform a purely informative function);

6. code (provides a specific language (or speech variety), through which a statement is made that facilitates the design of the judgment into a frame or script) [Jakobson, 1980, 81].

In the psycholinguistic researches that specialize on the aspects of the theory of speech acts, it is noted that a communicative situation includes such components as: the participants (addresser and addressee), the statement, the circumstances of the communication process, the purpose and the result of the interaction. The American psycholinguist S. Ervin-Tripp expended the scheme offering the following structure of the act of speech communication:

1. Local situation.
2. Communicators (the speaker and the listener), their personal qualities and characteristics.
3. Theme, that is the content of the speech act.
4. Functional aspects, or the effect on the sender of his own actions.
5. The form of communication, which consists of four components:
 - Communication channel (oral or written);
 - Code, that is, a set of speech signals;
 - Socially predetermined speech variants within a particular code;
 - Non-verbal signals [Ervin-Tripp, 1976].

Another scientist, I. Susov, noted that in each communicative act the speaker creates a kind of communicative-pragmatic space that includes:

- the speaker,
- his addressee,
- the statement,
- the subject of the statement,
- the time, place and environment of the act of interaction [Susov, 2007].

The theory of speech acts by J.L. Austin and J.R. Searle was the first offering to include the fragment of human activity as one of the determining elements of the structure of a communicative situation [Searle, Austin, 1968, 409].

Taking into account the peculiarities of the organization of cognitive activity, B. Gorodetsky offered the following scheme of a communicative situation:

- communicants (the speaker and the listener);
- a communicative text;
- the processes of verbalization and understanding;

- the circumstances of this communicative act;
- practical and communicative goals of the interlocutors [Gorodetsky, 1990, 42].

According to T. A. van Dijk, social communication as a part of social situations should be analyzed basing on the following categories:

1. participants of the process of socialization and their characteristics;
2. social structures (such as status and social role);
3. elements of interaction (such as friendliness, detachment, prejudice);
4. objects worth of attention at the exact communicative situation;
5. environment of the communication that includes its time and space boundaries and other physical attributes;
6. rules and traditions, limiting the actions that can be or should be performed in such a situation [Dijk, 1989, 84–85].

The characteristics of a communicative situation as a linguistic phenomenon given above allow us to conclude that speech activity of the communicants is directly connected to the extralinguistic factors and under their influence gets certain qualities and specific features. That is why the extralinguistic conditions of interlocutors' activities must be considered as systematic elements of communicative situations.

In the whole the extralinguistic components of a communication process can be divided into 4 groups: physical, social, psychological and informational. Physical components are time, space, information channel, physical text carrier, paralanguage, etc. Social elements are determined by the social sphere of the interlocutors (gender, age, social status, etc.). Psychological factors include emotional, personal and mental characteristics of communicators, their motives and aims, as well as their ideas about the communication partner and communication conditions. The informational components are characterized by the complex of verbal and non-verbal information [Yudanov, 2003, 71–72].

4. To the importance of the non-linguistic factors of a communicative situation

Today a communicative situation is considered to help linguists to understand the “real extent” of a discourse, because it is a speech activity in-process within the determinate social context that is directly connected to real life and time and fixed in oral or written texts [Nevinskaya, 2006, 12].

Communication is realized by means of a number of repeating communicative situations. And though each of them has some distinctive features, as we have seen before, they reproduce some permanent elements, forming its basis. G. P. Neshchimenko represented them as microsituations of communication that serve as a sort of filter allowing to fix characteristic situations of verbal communication that differ by the relationships of the communicants, theme, and extralinguistic circumstances [Neschimenko, 2003, 39].

A communicative situation is not a chaotic formation, but an entirety forming interaction of persons. All its elements are interdependent and mutually conditioned, that is why texts should not be analyzed without correlation to the non-linguistic reality. Speaking about a communicative situation we understand not a situation in a broad sense, but a situation that due to certain objective and subjective factors (including speech) engages a person into speech communication and determines his or her verbal behavior as an addresser as well as addressee within one communicative act [Skalkin, 1991, 174].

Basing on our research we suppose that the most significant elements of a communicative situation are:

1. The initiator of the communication;
2. The addresser (sometimes it corresponds with the initiator), taken into account within his verbal and non-verbal activity — the author of the text;
3. The physical circumstances of communication (time, place, etc.);
4. The referential situation — the object of discussion;
5. The channel of transferring of the information;
6. The imagery addressee — a set of presupposed characteristics of the real recipient of the message;
7. The text — a set of symbols that represents a model of verbal activity that is explicitly or implicitly offered the addressee by the author;
8. The addressee (recipient), taken into account within his verbal and non-verbal activity.

Despite the sophisticated system of a communicative situation it is perceived as a whole in the process of interaction, changing of only one structural element may cause formation of an absolutely new communicative situation. For example, the communicative situations of representation of news by means of television and printed mass media differ significantly though most of their elements are the same. So, both situations are characterized by probably the same participants of the communication process (the initia-

tor, the addresser (represented by a single journalist or an editorial board) and the mass addressee). There can be discussed the same referential situation, but the verbal component of the texts is likely to differ due to the informational channel.

E.g. *This photo of them became a symbolic image during the election and the three women drew record crowds to their rallies.* [BBC, URL]

The presence of audio and visual information allows the author of the text to use the demonstrative pronouns with wide semantic range of meanings and at the same time be sure that the addressee is to understand the idea of the utterance the right way.

According to modern theories of pragmatic analysis of texts, verbal and non-verbal activities of the interlocutors are interdependent. A situation arises only in context of some human activity and the purpose of the activity is to a great extent guided by the situation. So the speech activity within a certain communicative situation is always determined by the character of some non-speech activity. When the non-speech activities performed by the interlocutors got into contact with each other there emerges the necessity of verbal activity as a way to coordinate them. In this case, a communication situation represents a coherence of interactions performed by some language means between an addresser and his audience. The text content is predominated by the exact activities, communicators' language skills, cognitive and emotive bases, aims and motives of the interaction.

The theme of the communicative situation is always imposed by the current state of the everyday, professional and social aims of the interlocutors (e.g. discussing a document, solving some kind of problem, etc.). Considering the category of interlocutors' activities is crucial for the correct understanding of the semantic relations as they never function beyond activities. Semantics of a text is always a result of synthesis of factors that do not exist without non-verbal activities [Sidorov, 2012, 89].

Each interlocutor performing primary (coding) and secondary (decoding) speech activity becomes a kind of a "node of decoding of the verbal information" [Sharafan, 2008, 81] that designates the interpersonal character of communication. The final decision on the composition and structure of the statement is made by the addresser within his or her verbal activity that is performed in coordination with the verbal and non-verbal activities of the addressee. Herewith, by "verbal activity" we understand a kind of mental activity of speech production that is induced by a necessity and

viability, is correlated to reality and performed by a number of actions and operations with resources of the language system which are oriented toward the communicative abilities and communicative experience of the addressee [Sidorov, 2012, 89].

The idea that should be exteriorized by means of an utterance is formed under the influence of the motive. Due to the interactive character of a motive, the utterance is an idea of the addresser that is used to arouse the same idea in the addressee's mind.

To handle accurately in the future communication situation the author of the text should form and keep in his or her mind a kind of "a perfect image of the addressee" [Sidorov, 2010, 38] to which average and stereotyped features of the future recipient are ascribed. M. M. Bahtin insisted: "When speaking, I always take into account the appreciative background of my speech understanding by the listener: whether he is competent in the theme of discussion, or has some special knowledge about the cultural peculiarities of the communication situation, his opinions and beliefs, prejudications (from our point of view), his sympathies and antipathies — all these things would specify his understanding of my utterance. These factors will designate the genre of the utterance as well as the choice of compositional devices and, finally, the language means" [Bahtin, 2010, 291].

The journalists or the editorial board being the addresser within the Mass Media communicative situation form a text that is supposed to be read by the certain audience of the periodical. In other words they mentally construct a "perfect image of the potential addressees" that is a semantic and pragmatic category including the possible characteristics of the information recipients (e.g. age, social status, political preferences, religion, etc.) that determines the use of linguistic means.

The potential addressee is supposed to be the central figure of the communication that is why the semantics of the text has not egocentric, but interactive basis. To be sure the individual will understand the discussed reality correctly and completely, the speaker always has to prognosticate all the possible interpretations of the text [Frank, 1999, 253].

The texts of prototypical communicative situations form a certain kind of discourse (e.g. political, mass media, economical, etc.). V. I. Karasik in his definition of a "discourse" makes an accent on its suggestive character, understanding it as a sort of manipulative practice or interactive activity of the interlocutors that includes establishing and maintaining of contact,

emotional and informational interchange, eliciting effect on each other, a set of changing communicative strategies and their verbal and non-verbal realizations in the process of communication [Karasik, 2000, 5]. That is why we can state that primary communicative activity of the author is always aimed at changing of non-verbal activity of the addressee by means of his or her secondary communicative activity. Successful manipulative influence, besides the linguistic component, considerably depends on the extralinguistic factors or “situation” within which goes on the communication and due to which linguistic components are chosen [Kozhina, 2003, 624].

Communication procedures have always been used not only for human cooperation and information interchange, but also as a tool of social control. According to E. Sidorov in the modern researches of speech communication the communicative relationships of interlocutors are understood as a necessity of the addresser to control the activity of the addressee by language means to his or her own advantage that makes it of great importance to take into account different characteristics of the potential addressee [Sidorov, 2008, 59–60].

Thus, the motive of the communicative activity of the addresser is to meet the necessity of linguistic manipulation by the addressee's non-verbal activity. And the real coordination of human activities is possible only by means of linguistic manipulation. The motive of the verbal activity of the addressee, according to E. V. Sidorov, is to meet the necessity of getting through the communication channel some knowledge that he or she needs to understand the world around him [Sidorov, 2008, 79]. In other words the language manipulation is based on the communicative and cognitive motives of the recipient. And the communication in the whole is an integral unit of manipulating-cooperating relationships of the communicative situation components.

In these circumstances the text becomes a special kind of realization of manipulative intentions of the author, his or her axiological beliefs [Sidorova, 2020, 122], attitudes to the communication partner and the conditions of communication that are represented by language means referring to the communication situation and generating in the recipient's mind a certain system of representations (meanings). For the addresser the text represents a “sign-oriented product-model” of communication activity, and for addressee it is a “sign-oriented program of its realization” [Sidorov, 2010, 84].

The most important task of the text addressee is to decode the given symbol system. Correct understanding of meanings offered by the author

of the text is possible only in coordination with the subject-matter and conditions of communication. The success of the addresser's intentions directly depends on the correct understanding of the message by the addressee, on the way he or she interprets the linguistic and extralinguistic codes, and as a result whether the recipient wants and can change his or her non-verbal activity due to the linguistic model of actions given by the author. That is why the addressee of the communicative situation is an active participant of the interaction who as well can produce some responding signals (verbal or non-verbal) influencing this way the further development of the communication process.

It always should be taken into account that the secondary communicative activity of the recipient is always creative and subjective process specified by his or her personal characteristics and non-verbal activity. That is why we can say that non-verbal activity of the communicative situation participants is an important characteristic of the communication process and helps to understand the correct way the structure and functioning of interaction of the addresser and addressee.

5. Semantics

Pragmatic factors of the communicative situation understanding play significant role in cognitive and practical activity of the interlocutors. Any extralinguistic task makes a communicator while apprehending a text to be guided by a certain objective. That is why the principles of semantic choice of language means and semantic discourse construction imply notgnoseological accuracy of the chosen meaning, but interactive-pragmatic accuracy. If someone says something, it means that someone is offered a kind of a verbalized program of actions (behavior) [Sidorov, Arutyunova, 2011, 113].

The analysis of semantics of the Mass Media texts that does not take into account cognitive and pragmatic factors cannot explain the real mechanisms determining the organization of the discourse in the whole, because the semantic and pragmatic structures function within the discourse as an open non-linear system that permanently interacts with the external environment (interlocutors' consciousness and the communicative situation).

The decoded information undergoes some additional mental processing — interpretation of the text, that helps the addressee to understand what exactly the addresser wanted to say by the used implicit forms.

As the caseload continues to rise exponentially in the U.S. and other parts of the world, scientists are racing to find antiviral drugs that are effective in alleviating the worst ravages of the disease, a devastating pneumonia that affects an alarmingly high number of patients. The goal is to give doctors a broader range of weapons in the weeks and months ahead, and save lives [Newsweek, 2020, 18].

In this example, basing on the components of the communicative situation (the referential situation — the coronavirus, the audience — the Americans, the channel of information — printed and the Internet versions of the periodical), the author successfully realized the extended metaphor, comparing the epidemic with a war. The literary technique becomes evident by the words that are commonly used in the description of wars (e.g. *racing (of arms), devastating, alarm, range of weapons*).

When a person perceives the idea of an utterance he or she starts a cognitive process of decoding the information and forming the subjective representation of the described piece of reality, or, in other words, the addressee analyses and converts the offered text into his or her own idea [Sidorov, Smerchinskaya, 2016, 164].

In this case the non-verbal contextual information can be considered as the “clues” that make up an overall situation in which the interlocutors choose the correct meaning of the language means of the text. Relying on the “clues” of the everyday life helps the participants of communication to act according to certain situations without giving it some conscientious understanding. Such a practice helps the interlocutors to vary the semantics of the verbal means according to their motives. The semantic resources of the verbal activity of the speaker and the presupposed semantic resources of the verbal activity of the possible addressee that are realized as a combined structure determine a binary-associated constructive character of the semantic nature of an utterance within a discourse. This character is based on a certain constructive decision of realization of the precise meaning of the lexical unit on the implicit and explicit level of the utterance [Sidorov, 2013, 140].

6. Results and discussions

The results of the article demonstrate us that the notion of a “communicative situation” is of great importance for further linguistic researches which due to the modern scientific paradigms demand going beyond studying language as an isolated system. Speaking about the Mass Media texts the ex-

tralinguistic context of communication facilitates the deepest understanding of the political constituent of the message and that is crucial in the conditions of the modern geopolitical situation.

In this work we did not only enumerated the most important components of a communicative situation, but as well demonstrated their influence upon the semantics of the text.

7. Conclusions

A communicative situation turns out to be not a chaotic formation, but an entirety forming interaction of persons. All its elements are interdependent and mutually conditioned, that is why the analysis of texts should be performed in correlation with the non-linguistic reality.

Despite the sophisticated system of a communicative situation it is perceived as a whole in the process of interaction, changing of only one structural element may cause formation of an absolutely new communicative situation.

Extralinguistic factors of the communicative situation understanding play significant role in cognitive and practical activity of the interlocutors.

The further research of prototypical communicative situations and ways of their functioning and identification is very important. Although many theories of their structure exist in linguistics and philosophy of language, we still lack a reliable practical toolset necessary for further research in this field.

References:

1. A. A. Bernackaja. O legetimnosti analiza hudozhestvennogo teksta v aspekte informacionno-psihologicheskoy vojny. Jekologija jazyka i kommunikativnaya praktika [About the legitimacy of the analysis of a literary text in the aspects of information and psychological warfare. Ecology of language and communication practices.]. № 3 (2018), pp. 67–79.
2. Aristotel. Antichnye ritoriki.[Aristotle. Ancient rhetoric]. Moscow (1978).
3. R. Jakobson. The Framework of language. East Lansing: University of Michigan Press (1980).
4. S. Ervin-Tripp. Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. Language in Society №5 (1976), pp. 25–66.
5. I. P. Susov. Vvedenie v teoreticheskoe jazykoznanie [Introduction to theoretical linguistics]. Moscow (2007).
6. J. R. Searle. Austin on Locutionary and Illocutionary Acts. The Philosophical Review. Vol.77. № 4. Duke University Press, Cornell (1968), pp. 405–424.

7. B. Ju. Gorodeckij. Ot lingvistiki jazyka — k lingvistike obshhenija. Jazyk i social'noe poznanie [From the linguistics of language to the linguistics of communication. The language and social enterprise of the “the knowledge”]. Moscow (1990), pp. 39–56.
8. T. A. van Dejk. Jazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikacija [Language. Knowledge. Communication]. Moscow (1989).
9. E. T. Judanova. Suggestivnaja funkcija jazykovyh sredstv anglojazychnogo politicheskogo diskursa. Dissertacija na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni kandidata filol. n. [Suggestive function of language means of the English-language political discourse. Dissertation for the degree of candidate of Philology] (2003).
10. M. D. Nevinskaja. Konceptual'naja oppozicija “narod-vlast” v politicheskom diskurse [The conceptual opposition “people-power” in the political discourse] (2006).
11. G. P. Neshhimenko. Jazykovaja situacija v slavjanskih stranah: Opyt opisanija. Analiz koncepcij [The language situation in Slavic countries: the experience of the description. The analysis of the concept]. Moscow (2003).
12. V. L. Skalkin. Obshhaja metodika obuchenija inostrannym jazykam [General methods of teaching foreign languages]. Moscow (1991).
13. What lies behind the Belarus protests? https://www.bbc.com/news/video_and_audio/headlines/53877211/belarus-what-lies-behind-the-protests (Accessed 24 August 2020)
14. E. V. Sidorov. Koordinacionnoe osnovanie semanticheskogo otnoshenija v diskurse. Uchjonye zapiski [Coordination basis of the semantic relations in the discourse. Scientific notes] № 4 (2012), pp. 87–89
15. I. V. Sharafan. Publichnyj dialog: k postroeniju modeli kommunikativnoj situacii. Vestnik VGU, serija: lingvistika i mezhhkul'turnaja kommunikacija [Public dialogue: building a model of a communicative situation. VSU Bulletin, series: linguistics and intercultural communication] № 2. (2008), pp. 80–85.
16. E. V. Sidorov. Obshhaja teorija rechevoj kommunikacii: ucheb. posobie [General theory of speech communication: textbook]. Moscow (2010).
17. M. M. Bahtin. Jestetika slovesnogo tvorčestva [Esthetics of verbal creativity]. Moscow (1986).
18. D. Frank. Sem' grehov pragmatiki: tezisy o teorii rechevyh aktov, analize rechevogo obshhenija, lingvistike i ritorike. Zarubezhnaja lingvistika [Seven sins of pragmatics: theses on the theory of speech acts, analysis of speech communication, linguistics And rhetoric. Zarubezhnaja lingvistika] II. Moscow.

19. V.I. Karasik. Jazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse]. Volgograd (2002).

20. M.N. Kozhina. Jekstralingvističeskie stileobrazujuščie factory funkcionálnyh stilej. Stilističeskij enciklopedičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka [Extralinguistic style — forming factories of functional styles./ Stylistic encyclopedia of the Russian language]. Moscow (2003).

21. E.V. Sidorov. Ontologija diskursa [Ontology of discourse]. Moscow (2008).

22. N.A. Sidorova. Cennosti kak orientir kommunikativnyh dejstvij. Kazanskaja nauka [Values as a reference point for communicative actions. Kazan science]. № 2 (2020), pp. 121–124.

23. E.V. Sidorov, N. Je. Arutjunova. Znakovaja proekcija normativnoj shemy povedenija na organizaciju semantiki. Učenie zapiski [Sign projection of the normative scheme of behavior on the organization of discourse semantics. Scientific notes] № 10 (2011).

24. A. Piore. The Race for Answers. Newsweek International. Vol. 174. No. 09 (2020), pp. 18–25

25. E.V. Sidorov, A.A. Smerčinskaja. Sub#ektivnye motivy v organizacii semantiki diskursa i znakovaja koordinacija dejtel'nostej kommunikantov [Subjective motives in the organization of discourse semantics and sign-oriented coordination of actual communicants' activities]. Vestnik KGU im. N.A. Nekrasova, № 1 (2016), pp. 164–166.

26. E.V. Sidorov. Osobennost' semantičeskogo otnošeniya v diskurse. Kul'turno-jazykovoe vzaimodejstvie v processe prepodavanija disciplin kul'turologičeskogo i lingvističeskogo ciklov v sovremennom polijetničeskom VUZe [Specific features of semantic relations in discourse. Cultural and linguistic interaction in the process of teaching the disciplines of cultural and linguistic cycles in a modern multi-ethnic University] (2013), pp. 140–146.